



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/058,790	01/30/2002	Akihiro Denda	107156-00095	4718

7590 11/06/2006

ARENT FOX KINTNER PLOTKIN & KAHN, PLLC
Suite 600
1050 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20036-5339

EXAMINER

PSITOS, ARISTOTELIS M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2627

DATE MAILED: 11/06/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/058,790	Applicant(s) DENDA ET AL.	
	Examiner Aristotelis M. Psitos	Art Unit 2627	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 August 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Applicants' response of 8/15/06 has been considered with the following results.

The above communication has been re-evaluated/considered as a further request for reconsideration of the restriction noted in the OA of 5/30/06. The restriction requirement is NO LONGER maintained, and hence all pending claims have been re-evaluated. Claims 1-18 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

1. Claims 1,3-6,10-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over either the EP document 0997900 or under 102 (e) as anticipated by the US equivalent patent 6553532

With respect to apparatus claim 1, the document to Aoki, either the EP or the US discloses in this environment the ability of reading source information and writing it to a record medium –2. The write device of claim 1 is interpreted as element 4, whereas the read device is interpreted as inherently present as discussed at col. 6 line 27 to col. 7 line 31 in the US patent and the equivalent passages in the EP document.

The detecting means, determination means and the control means are inherently present – see the description starting at col. 8 line 39 to col. 9 line 64. The ability to detect an interruption, determine the write status and the appropriate control means is present in order to carry out a rewrite/retry of the information to complete the recording that was aborted due to read/write interruption.

Although the document doesn't specifically mention that the source of the information to be recorded onto the record 2 is from a first information storage medium, the examiner interprets the source of information as described in the above passages of the US/EP document as an obvious modification from the teaching from Sato, which discloses duplicating systems from a primary/source to a secondary target/slave recording medium.

Art Unit: 2627

It would have been obvious to modify the base system of Aoki with the well-known ability of having a "mother" source as the source of information in a duplicating apparatus as providing the input for subsequent recording upon duplicates, copies. Motivation is to provide an appropriate source of incoming information.

With respect to claims 3,4, the examiner interprets such as the indication/evaluation of the ecc as discussed with respect to the operation of the Aoki system – col. 8 line 39 to col. 9 line 64.

With respect to the limitations of claims 5,6 and 15, they are inherently present in the above system – see the flow charts and the accompanying disclosure in the US Aoki reference.

With respect to the auxiliary power source and its operation in the claims, applicants' attention is also drawn to figure 16 and the disclosure thereof - the 6th embodiment – see the disclosure starting at col. 19 line 45.

With respect to claim 10, all elements as noted above are found/met.

With respect to claim 11, such a function occurs from the power failure detection.

With respect to claim 12, the examiner interprets this function to exist – i.e., when the check is made as to the maintain the operation of the overall system.

With respect to claim 13, such is present – i.e., the abnormality flag of figure 2.

With respect to claim 14 such are present.

The limitations of claims 16-18 are met when the above system operates.

2. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the art as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Tanaka et al.

Although the base reference to Aoki discusses "interruptions" of electric power at col. 9 lines 54-56, there is no clear depiction of this being a power failure.

Tanaka et al teach in a similar environment, monitoring of electrical power, and upon failure thereof, appropriate detection thereof precipitates further action by the controller and subunits.

Art Unit: 2627

It would have been obvious to modify the base system of Aoki with such monitoring of electrical power failure as opposed to merely that of an "interruption". The examiner considers monitoring of an operating condition for "failure" as opposed to "interruption" as being obvious variants over one another.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 2/23/06 are not persuasive.

Applicants' arguments on pages 12 and 13 are drawn to subject matter found in claim 10, not claim 1.

Conclusion

Applicants' attention is also drawn to the cited JP 11-167787 reference – see abstract, which also discloses in this environment a power interruption compensation system.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Aristotelis M. Psitos whose telephone number is (571) 272-7594. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F: 6:00 - 2:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dwayne D. Bost can be reached on (571) 272-7023. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2627

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Aristotelis M Psitos
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2627

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'A. Psitos', written over the printed name and title.

AMP